

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY DESCRIPTION

The Strategic subcategory consists of bases which support both nuclear and conventional bomber missions, as well as tanker, missile and reconnaissance missions. Important attributes required to accomplish these missions are:

### **Nuclear Bomber:**

- Survivability
- Adequate weapons storage
- Tanker support
- Minimum expenditure of flying hours for training
- Access to low level routes
- Minimum traffic congestion/ATC delays

### **Tanker:**

- Tanker and SIOP bomber units collocated
- Minimum expenditure of flying hours for training
- Access to receiver units
- Minimum traffic congestion/ATC delays

### **Conventional Bomber:**

- Minimum expenditure of flying hours for training
- Access to low level routes
- Access to bombing ranges
- Tanker support
- Minimum traffic congestion/ATC delays

### **ICBM:**

- Capable silos, launch control facilities, and adequate weapons storage
- Potential for future weapons systems

### **Reconnaissance:**

- Secure facilities which included aircraft parking, specialized support facilities, and intelligence centers
- Minimum traffic congestion/ATC delay
- Good flying weather

UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

The following bases were considered in the strategic subcategory:

Barksdale AFB, Louisiana  
Carswell AFB, Texas  
Dyess AFB, Texas  
Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota  
Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota  
Grissom AFB, Indiana  
Loring AFB, Maine  
March AFB, California  
Minot AFB, North Dakota  
Plattsburgh AFB, New York  
Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan

Beale AFB, California  
Castle AFB, California  
Eaker AFB, Arkansas  
Fairchild AFB, Washington  
Griffiss AFB, New York  
KI Sawyer AFB, Michigan  
Malmstrom AFB, Montana  
McConnell AFB, Kansas  
Offutt AFB, Nebraska  
Whiteman AFB, Missouri

# UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CAPACITY ANALYSIS**

**This page is classified SECRET and is located in the classified appendix.**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## CARSWELL AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, is recommended for closure. The 7th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52H aircraft will transfer to Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). The 301st Tactical Fighter Wing (AFRES), 73rd Aerial Port Squadron (AFRES), 457th Tactical Fighter Squadron (AFRES) and the 20th Medical Services Squadron (AFRES) will remain at Carswell Air Force Base in an efficient cantonment area containing only the direct support facilities. The 436th Strategic Training Squadron (SAC) will relocate to Dyess Air Force Base, Texas. All other active duty personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Carswell Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Carswell Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory and is recommended for closure. While Carswell Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of Carswell Air Force Base is impacted by severe local and regional encroachment. Carswell Air Force Base also ranked below average in wartime tanker utility. The cost to close Carswell Air Force Base is relatively low.

The closure of Carswell Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 20,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 12,000 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 212 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 1,200,000, available jobs just over 600,000, and regional annual income of 17 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$156M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$45.5M. All values are in constant dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## CASTLE AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Castle Air Force Base, California, is recommended for closure. The 93rd Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The bomber and tanker Combat Crew Training missions will transfer to Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington. The B-52G conventional aircraft will transfer to KI Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component and other active units. All other active duty personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Castle Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Castle Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Castle Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Peacetime and wartime tanker utility negatively impact the long term military value of Castle Air Force Base. Also, encroachment on the base and flight patterns is significant. The condition of the facilities at Castle Air Force Base is below average in the Strategic subcategory, and the housing deficit is much greater than average. Additionally, the cost to close Castle Air Force Base is relatively low and the savings are favorable.

The closure of Castle Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 16,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 9,000 jobs, and regional income loss approaching 162 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 492,000, available jobs close to 216,000, and regional annual income of 6.5 billion dollars. Castle Air Force Base is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$63M. This savings could be increased by approximately \$27M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$52.7M. All values are in constant dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## EAKER AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Eaker Air Force Base, Arkansas, is recommended for closure. The 97th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G Air Launched Cruise Missile aircraft will retire. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to other KC-135 units. All other active duty personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Eaker Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Eaker Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Eaker Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of Eaker Air Force Base ranked below average because of both peacetime and wartime tanker utility and access to bombing ranges. Also, the cost to close Eaker Air Force Base is very low and the savings are very high.

The closure of Eaker Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 4,600 jobs, and regional income loss of just over 83 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 202,000, available jobs close to 99,000, and regional annual income of 2.2 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$220M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$52.9M. All values are in constant dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## GRISSOM AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, is recommended for closure. The 305th Air Refueling Wing will inactivate. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). The EC-135 aircraft will retire. The 434th Air Refueling Wing (AFRES), the 930th Tactical Fighter Group (AFRES), and the 930th Civil Engineering Squadron (AFRES) will remain. The 930th Tactical Fighter Group will convert to the KC-135 and that unit's A-10s will retire. The Air Force Reserve units will be grouped in an efficient cantonment area containing only the essential direct supporting facilities. The Air Force Reserve will operate the airfield unless the local/state authorities decide to convert to a civil airport. The airfield and all operational facilities will be retained and those facilities not required by the Reserves will be mothballed for future contingencies. However, the airfield and these facilities would be made available as required to support joint civil use. All family housing and community support facilities including the hospital, base exchange, commissary and all morale and welfare facilities not authorized for Reserve units will be declared excess and made available for disposal. All other active duty personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Grissom Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Grissom Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Grissom Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. As an active base, Grissom Air Force Base ranked lower in long term military value because of peacetime and wartime tanker utility as well as access to bombing ranges. Additionally, the cost to close Grissom Air Force Base is low and the savings are substantial. The condition of the existing facilities at Grissom Air Force Base is ranked well below the average.

The closure of Grissom Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,700 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 5,200 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 88 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 197,000, available jobs close to 101,000, and regional annual income of 2.6 billion dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

## **UNCLASSIFIED**

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$157M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$48.3M. All values are in constant dollars.

**UNCLASSIFIED**



# UNCLASSIFIED

## LORING AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Loring Air Force Base, Maine, is recommended for closure. The 42nd Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G conventional aircraft will transfer to KI Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan. The KC-135 aircraft will realign to the Air Reserve Component (ARC) and other active units. All remaining personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Loring Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Loring Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Loring Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Loring Air Force Base ranked lower in long term military value due to limited peacetime tanker utility and access to bombing ranges. The condition of the existing facilities at Loring Air Force Base is well below average. The cost to close Loring Air Force Base is low and the savings are the highest of the bases considered in this subcategory.

The closure of Loring Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 22,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 9,900 jobs, and regional income loss of just over 92 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 49,100, available jobs close to 33,320, and regional annual income of 755 million dollars. Loring Air Force Base is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$182M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$61.8M. All values are in constant dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## WURTSMITH AIR FORCE BASE

**Recommendation:** Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, is recommended for closure. The 379th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G Air Launched Cruise Missile aircraft will retire. The KC-135 aircraft will relocate and transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). All other personnel will depart.

**Justification:** The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Wurtsmith Air Force Base was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Wurtsmith Air Force Base ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Wurtsmith Air Force Base's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term overall military value of Wurtsmith Air Force Base is below average because of distance to low altitude training routes, and poor peacetime tanker utility. The cost to close Wurtsmith Air Force Base is very low and the savings very high.

The closure of Wurtsmith Air Force Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,400 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 4,600 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 94 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of 87,600, available jobs close to 34,800, and regional annual income of 987 million dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$256M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$63.3M. All values are in constant dollars.

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY SPECIFIC ACTIONS/IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

<u>UNIT</u>	<u>DISPOSITION</u>
<b>CARSWELL AFB, TEXAS</b>	
7th Bombardment Wing	Inactivates
301 TFW (AFRES)	Remains
73 APS (AFRES)	Remains
457 TFS (AFRES)	Remains
20 MSS (AFRES)	Remains
436 STS (SAC)	Dyess AFB, Texas
<b>CASTLE AFB, CALIFORNIA</b>	
93rd Bombardment Wing	Inactivates
<b>EAKER AFB, ARKANSAS</b>	
97th Bombardment Wing	Inactivates
<b>GRISSOM AFB, INDIANA</b>	
305th Air Refueling Wing	Inactivates
930 TFG (AFRES)	Inactivates
434 ARW (AFRES) W/20 KC-135s	Remains
930 CES (AFRES)	Remains
199 SUPP CO (ARMY NATIONAL GUARD)	TBD
<b>LORING AFB, MAINE</b>	
42nd Bombardment Wing	Inactivates
<b>WURTSMITH AFB, MICHIGAN</b>	
379th Bombardment Wing	Inactivates

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY  
CRITERIA**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

) ) )

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE**

**CLOSURE RATING (G,Y,R)**

**1. Is existing force structure for primary mission of the base remaining in the inventory?**

GREEN - Force structure is a key part of the force structure plan -  
no programmed reductions  
YELLOW - Force structure is an integral part of the force structure plan -  
but has programmed reductions  
RED - Force structure is being phased out in the force structure plan

**2. Operational effectiveness**

**A. Geographic location supports mission**

**Survivability:** Classified definition contained in SAC Regulation 11-45, SAC EWO GLOSSARY  
See Classified appendix for criteria

**Alternate base:** GREEN < 1 hour FLT time; YELLOW < 2 hours; RED > 2 hours

**Weather impact on mission:**  
GREEN - 75% above 1500/3, < 10 days icing;  
YELLOW - 50% above 1500/3, < 20 days icing  
RED - anything else

**Air Traffic Delay** GREEN - AVG ATC Delay < 10 min; YELLOW - < 20 min; RED - Anything more

**B. Wartime**

<b>Tanker SIOP support:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>SIOP Support:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>Mating:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>Planning Flexibility:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>Facilities:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>Future SILO missile systems:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria
<b>Future MOBILE missile systems:</b>	See classified appendix for criteria

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**C. Peacetime**

**Bombing Range:** Green < 1 hour FLT time; Yellow < 2 hours; Red > 2 hours

**Conventional Enhanced Release Training:** GREEN - YES; RED - NO

**Low Altitude Scored Route:** Green < 1 hour FLT time; Yellow < 2 Hours; Red > 2 Hours

**Distance to the STRC:** GREEN < 600 NM; YELLOW < 1200 NM; RED > 1200

**Distance to highly concentrated RCVR area:** GREEN < 400 NM; YELLOW < 800; RED > 800

**Tanker saturation within the region:** GREEN = tanker poor; YELLOW = balanced; RED = tanker rich

**D. Potential for Airspace/Training Area growth**

**GREEN -** Airspace available for future expansion; supports advance basing concept

**YELLOW -** Status Quo

**RED -** Reductions possible

**3. If there is force structure to support other categories at the base, will they remain in the inventory?**

**GREEN -** Force structure is a key part of the force structure plan  
no programmed reductions

**YELLOW -** Force structure is an integral part of the force structure plan - but has  
programmed reductions

**RED -** Force structure is being phased out in the force structure plan, or  
NO other FS assigned

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE**

1. Is existing force structure for primary mission of the base remaining in the inventory

	BMR	TNK	MSL	RECCE
BARKSDALE	R	Y		
BEALE		Y		G
CARSWELL	G	Y		
CASTLE	G	Y		
DYESS	G	Y		
EAKER	R	Y		
ELLSWORTH	G	Y	R	
FAIRCHILD	G	Y		
GRAND FORKS	G	Y	G	
GRIFFISS	Y	Y		
GRISSOM		Y		
KI SAWYER	G	Y		
LORING	G	Y		
MALMSTROM		Y	Y	
MARCH		G		
McCONNELL	G	Y		
MINOT	G	Y	G	
OFFUTT				G
PLATTSBURGH	R	Y		
WHITEMAN	G		R	
WURTSMITH	R	Y		

GREEN - FS is key part of FS plan - no programmed reductions  
 YELLOW - FS an integral part of FS plan with programmed reductions  
 RED - FS being phased out in the FS plan

Criteria I, 1

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE

##### 2A. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:

	Survivability	Alternate	WX	ATC Delay
BARKSDALE	G	G	G	G
BEALE	G	G	G	G
CARSWELL	G	G	G	Y
CASTLE	G	G	G	G
DYESS	G	G	G	G
EAKER	G	G	G	G
ELLSWORTH	G	G	G	G
FAIRCHILD	G	G	G	G
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G	G
GRIFFISS	G	G	Y	G
GRISSOM	G	G	G	G
KI SAWYER	G	G	Y	G
LORING	G	G	Y	G
MALMSTROM	G	G	G	G
MARCH	G	G	G	Y
McCONNELL	G	G	G	G
MINOT	G	G	G	G
OFFUTT	G	G	G	G
PLATTSBURGH	G	G	G	G
WHITEMAN	G	G	G	G
WURTSMITH	G	G	G	G

See classified appendix for criteria

UNCLASSIFIED



**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL  
 READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE**

**2B. WARTIME**

	Tanker SPT	SIOP Spt	Mating
BARKSDALE	R	G	Y
BEALE	G	R	R
CARSWELL	Y	G	R
CASTLE	G	R	R
DYESS	Y	G	R
EAKER	R	G	Y
ELLSWORTH	G	G	G
FAIRCHILD	G	G	Y
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G
GRIFFISS	G	G	G
GRISSOM	G	Y	G
KI SAWYER	G	G	G
LORING	G	G	G
MALMSTROM	G	G	G
MARCH	Y	R	R
McCONNELL	Y	G	Y
MINOT	G	G	G
OFFUTT	G	Y	G
PLATTSBURGH	G	G	G
WHITEMAN	Y	Y	G
WURTSMITH	G	G	G

See classified appendix for criteria

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE

##### 2B. WARTIME - Missile

	Flexibility	Facility	Silo	Mobile
BARKSDALE				
BEALE				
CARSWELL				
CASTLE				
DYESS				
EAKER				
ELLSWORTH	G	R	R	G
FAIRCHILD				
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G	Y
GRIFFISS				
GRISSOM				
KI SAWYER				
LORING				
MALMSTROM	G	G	G	G
MARCH				
McCONNELL				
MINOT	G	G	G	Y
OFFUTT				
PLATTSBURGH				
WHITEMAN	R	G	G	Y
WURTSMITH				

See classified appendix for criteria

Criteria I, 2X

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLAS FIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE

#### 2C. PEACETIME

	BMB RNG	CERT	LOW LEVEL	STRC	RCVR Area	Saturation
BARKSDALE	G	R	G	Y	G	G
BEALE	G	R	G	Y	R	Y
CARSWELL	G	R	G	Y	G	G
CASTLE	G	R	G	Y	Y	Y
DYESS	G	R	G	Y	G	G
EAKER	G	G	G	Y	Y	G
ELLSWORTH	G	R	G	G	Y	Y
FAIRCHILD	Y	R	G	Y	R	R
GRAND FORKS	Y	R	G	G	R	Y
GRIFFISS	R	R	G	Y	R	R
GRISSOM	Y	R	G	Y	Y	Y
KI SAWYER	Y	G	Y	Y	R	Y
LORING	R	G	G	R	R	R
MALMSTROM	Y	R	Y	G	R	R
MARCH	G	R	G	Y	R	R
McCONNELL	G	R	G	G	G	G
MINOT	Y	G	G	G	R	Y
OFFUTT	G	R	G	G	G	G
PLATTSBURGH	R	R	G	Y	R	R
WHITEMAN	G	R	Y	Y	G	G
WURTSMITH	Y	R	Y	Y	R	Y

Bombing Range: Green < 1 hour FLT time; Yellow < 2 hours; Red > 2 hours

Conventional Enhanced Release Training: GREEN - YES; RED - NO

Low Altitude Scored Route: Green < 1 hour FLT time; Yellow < 2 Hours; Red > 2 Hours

Distance to the STRC: GREEN < 600 NM; YELLOW < 1200 NM; RED > 1200

Distance to highly concentrated RCVR area: GREEN < 400 NM; YELLOW < 800; RED > 800

Tanker saturation within the region: GREEN = tanker poor; YELLOW = balanced; RED = tanker rich

Criteria 1, 12Y

# UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE

#### 2D. POTENTIAL FOR AIRSPACE/TRAINING AREA GROWTH

	Potential Growth
BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	R
CASTLE	Y
DYESS	G
EAKER	G
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	Y
GRISSOM	Y
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	G
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	R
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	Y
WHITEMAN	G
WURTSMITH	G

GREEN - Airspace available for future expansion; supports advance basing concept  
 YELLOW - Status Quo  
 RED - Reductions possible

Criteria I, 2D

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED  
FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**I. THE CURRENT AND FUTURE MISSION REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPACT ON OPERATIONAL  
READINESS OF DOD's TOTAL FORCE**

3. If there is force structure to support other categories  
at the base, will they remain in the inventory?

GREEN - FS is key part of FS plan - no programmed  
reductions

YELLOW - FS an integral part of FS plan with  
programmed reductions

RED - FS being phased out in the FS plan or  
NO other FS assigned

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	G
CASTLE	R
DYESS	R
EAKER	R
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	R
GRIFFISS	R
GRISSOM	Y
KI SAWYER	R
LORING	R
MALMSTROM	R
MARCH	G
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	R
OFFUTT	R
PLATTSBURGH	R
WHITEMAN	R
WURTSMITH	R

Criteria I, 3

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

CRITERIA I

	Bomber	Tanker	Missile	Recco	Survivability	Alternate	Weather	ATC Delay	Tanker Support	SIOP Support	Mating	Flexibility	Facility	Silo	Mobile	Bombing Range	CERT	Low Level	STRC	Receiver	Saturation	Airspace Growth	Other Force Stru
BARKSDALE	R	Y			G	G	G	G	R	G	Y					G	R	G	Y	G	G	G	G
BEALE		Y		G	G	G	G	G	G	R	R					G	R	G	Y	R	Y	G	G
CARSWELL	G	Y			G	G	G	Y	Y	G	R					G	R	G	Y	G	G	R	G
CASTLE	G	Y			G	G	G	G	G	R	R					G	R	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	R
DYESS	G	Y			G	G	G	G	Y	G	R					G	R	G	Y	G	G	G	R
EAKER	R	Y			G	G	G	G	R	G	Y					G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	R
ELLSWORTH	G	Y	R		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	R	R	G	G	R	G	G	Y	Y	G	G
FAIRCHILD	G	Y			G	G	G	G	G	G	Y					Y	R	G	Y	R	R	G	G
GRAND FORKS	G	Y	G		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	R	G	G	R	Y	G	R
GRIFFISS	Y	Y			G	G	Y	G	G	G	G					R	R	G	Y	R	R	Y	R
GRISSOM		Y			G	G	G	G	G	Y	G					Y	R	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
KI SAWYER	G	Y			G	G	Y	G	G	G	G					Y	G	Y	Y	R	Y	G	R
LORING	G	Y			G	G	Y	G	G	G	G					R	G	G	R	R	R	G	R
MALMSTROM		Y	Y		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	R	Y	G	R	R	G	R
MARCH		G			G	G	G	Y	Y	R	R					G	R	G	Y	R	R	R	G
McCONNELL	G	Y			G	G	G	G	Y	G	Y					G	R	G	G	G	G	G	G
MINOT	G	Y	G		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	G	R	Y	G	R
OFFUTT				G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	G					G	R	G	G	G	G	G	R
PLATTSBURGH	R	Y			G	G	G	G	G	G	G					R	R	G	Y	R	R	Y	R
WHITEMAN	G		R		G	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	R	G	G	Y	G	R	Y	Y	G	G	G	R
WURTSMITH	R	Y			G	G	G	G	G	G	G					Y	R	Y	Y	R	Y	G	R

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**III. THE ABILITY TO ACCOMMODATE CONTINGENCY, MOBILIZATION, AND FUTURE TOTAL FORCE REQUIREMENTS AT BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING LOCATIONS**

6. What is the capacity of the parking apron?

GREEN - > 30% excess capacity over currently assigned aircraft  
YELLOW - 10% - 30% excess capacity  
RED - anything else

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
<u>CARSWELL</u>	Y
CASTLE	R
DYESS	G
<u>EAKER</u>	G
ELLSWORTH	Y
FAIRCHILD	G
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	G
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	G
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	G
LORING	Y
MALMSTROM	G
<u>MARCH</u>	G
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	R
<u>OFFUTT</u>	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	G
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	Y

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### III. THE ABILITY TO ACCOMMODATE CONTINGENCY, MOBILIZATION, AND FUTURE TOTAL FORCE REQUIREMENTS AT BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING LOCATIONS

7. Is the base located and have basic necessary characteristics to support another category's mission?  
(Assumes current mission no longer present)

	Mobility	Tactical	Fly Tng
BARKSDALE	G	G	R
BEALE	G	R	R
CARSWELL	G	Y	R
CASTLE	G	R	R
DYESS	G	Y	R
EAKER	G	Y	R
ELLSWORTH	R	R	R
FAIRCHILD	R	Y	R
GRAND FORKS	R	R	R
GRIFFISS	R	Y	R
GRISSOM	G	Y	R
KI SAWYER	R	Y	R
LORING	R	R	R
MALMSTROM	R	Y	R
MARCH	G	G	R
McCONNELL	G	G	R
MINOT	R	R	R
OFFUTT	R	Y	R
PLATTSBURGH	R	Y	R
WHITEMAN	R	Y	R
WURTSMITH	R	Y	R

GREEN - YES, meets requirements of MACRO LOOK with minor or less MILCON  
 YELLOW - YES, meets some requirements of MACRO LOOK with with major MILCON  
 RED - Does not meet requirements of MACRO LOOK

UNCLASSIFIED



**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**CRITERIA III**

	C-141 MOG	Food Hydrant	Total Mun Stor	Hot Cargo	Army/MC Inst	Rail Access	Port Facility	Parking Apron	Mobility	Tactical	Fly Tng
BARKSDALE	Y	G	Y	G	G	G	R	G	G	G	R
BEALE	R	G	G	G	R	G	G	G	G	R	R
CARSWELL	R	G	Y	G	G	G	R	Y	G	Y	R
CASTLE	Y	G	Y	G	G	G	G	R	G	R	R
DYESS	R	G	G	G	G	G	R	G	G	Y	R
EAKER	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	R
ELLSWORTH	Y	G	G	G	G	G	R	Y	R	R	R
FAIRCHILD	R	G	Y	G	R	G	R	G	R	Y	R
GRAND FORKS	Y	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	R	R
GRIFFISS	G	G	Y	G	G	G	G	G	R	Y	R
GRISSOM	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y	R
KI SAWYER	Y	G	Y	G	R	G	R	G	R	Y	R
LORING	Y	G	G	G	R	G	R	Y	R	R	R
MALMSTROM	R	G	G	G	G	G	R	G	R	Y	R
MARCH	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	R
McCONNELL	Y	G	G	G	G	G	R	G	G	G	R
MINOT	Y	G	G	G	R	G	R	R	R	R	R
OFFUTT	Y	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	Y	R
PLATTSBURGH	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	R	Y	R
WHITEMAN	Y	G	Y	G	G	G	R	G	R	Y	R
WURTSMITH	Y	Y	G	G	G	G	G	Y	R	Y	R

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED  
FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**IV. THE COST AND MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS**

1. ONE TIME CLOSURE COSTS: Programming impact; excludes one-time environmental impact which is included in criteria #8.
2. 20 YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE OF SAVINGS: Shows savings (positive number) derived by discounting costs and savings over a 20 year period
3. NET STEADY STATE SAVINGS: The annual recurring savings which result from avoiding the operating and personnel costs of the closed base as offset by the annual recurring costs such as CHAMPUS and housing as a result of closing the base
4. MANPOWER REDUCTIONS: Support manpower spaces eliminated as a result of closing the base

**V. THE EXTENT AND TIMING OF POTENTIAL COSTS AND SAVINGS, INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF YEARS, BEGINNING WITH THE DATE OF COMPLETION OF THE CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT, FOR THE SAVINGS TO EXCEED THE COSTS.**

1. INVESTMENT PAYBACK: Years elapsed from closure year to payback. Payback computed from Net Present Value (NPV) analysis using OMB Circular A-94

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**IV COST AND MANPOWER  
IMPLICATIONS**

**V RETURN ON  
INVESTMENT**

	ONE TIME CLOSURE COSTS		20 YEAR	STEADY STATE	MANPOWER	YEARS TO
	(TYSM)	(CYSM)	NPV (\$M)	NET SAVINGS	REDUCTIONS	PAYBACK
BARKSDALE	198.5	194.5	247	56.1	-1628	4
BEALE	106.5	94.4	328	54.4	-1346	1
CARSWELL	64.6	57.8	72	20.7	-1222	6
CASTLE	102.7	91.4	263	45.9	-1300	2
DYESS	238.2	212.4	210	53.3	-1455	5
EAKER	22.0	20.1	359	50.2	-1339	0
ELLSWORTH	319.3	265.4	107	56.6	-1534	Beyond 10
FAIRCHILD	76.6	68.6	384	59.5	-1595	1
GRAND FORKS	217.8	177.7	225	63.7	-1499	3
GRIFFISS	220.1	198.3	337	68.5	-1627	4
GRISSOM	35.0	31.5	250	36.9	-950	1
KI SAWYER	39.8	35.9	372	53.9	-1411	1
LORING	44.6	40.3	465	66.6	-1514	1
MALMSTROM	133.7	110.9	251	60.4	-1339	2
MARCH	137.0	121.4	175	38.2	-1138	4
McCONNELL	139.9	123.4	209	41.9	-1135	3
MINOT	115.0	96.1	255	62.4	-1556	2
OFFUTT	659.1	589.0	(340)	25.7	-1181	Beyond 20
PLATTSBURGH	27.0	24.4	413	57.8	-1214	0
WHITEMAN	447.0	372.8	6	54.5	-1451	Beyond 10
WURTSMITH	33.0	29.8	374	53.4	-1328	1

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### LAND VALUE ANALYSIS - SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC BASES

	NPL	RURAL	SMALL CITY	URBAN	OVERALL
BARKSDALE	R		Y		Y-
BEALE	R	G			G-
CARSWELL	R			R	R
CASTLE	G		Y		Y-
DYESS	R		Y		Y-
EAKER	R	G			G
ELLSWORTH	G	G			G
FAIRCHILD *	R			R	R
GRAND FORKS	R	G			G-
GRIFFISS	G		Y		Y
GRISSOM	R	G			G-
KI SAWYER	R	G			G-
LORING	G	G			G
MALMSTROM	R		Y		Y-
MARCH	R			R	R
MCCONNELL	R		R	R	R
MINOT	R	G			G-
OFFUTT					
PLATTSBURGH	G	G			G
WHITEMAN	R	G			G-
WURTSMITH	R	G			G-

\* 4 sites on NPL, but not the whole base

**NOTE:** Air Force experience with closing bases led to the conclusion that the near term potential for revenue from property sales would be too uncertain to include it as a formal element in the cost analysis. However, this information was available and considered by the BCI&G in its deliberation

Hard to sell; negligible return likely (G)  
 Eaker Ellsworth  
 Loring Plattsburgh

Low proceeds, if any (G-)  
 Beale Grand Forks  
 Grissom KI Sawyer  
 Minot Whiteman  
 Wurtsmith

Hard to sell, possibly some return someday (Y)  
 Castle Griffiss

Moderate prospects for positive return within 6 years (Y-)  
 Barksdale Dyess  
 Malmstrom

Best and earliest return (R)  
 Carswell, Fairchild  
 March, McConnell

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | <b>EMPLOYMENT</b>   | <b>GREEN</b> - Reductions exceed historic high reduction (1969-1987)<br><b>YELLOW</b> - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction (1969-1987)<br><b>RED</b> - Reductions are less than 50% of historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible  |
| 2. | <b>POPULATION</b>   | <b>GREEN</b> - Reductions exceed historic high reductions (1969-1987)<br><b>YELLOW</b> - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction (1969-1987)<br><b>RED</b> - Reductions are less than 50% of the historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible   |
| 3. | <b>INCOME</b>   | <b>GREEN</b> - Reductions exceed historic high reductions (1969-1987)<br><b>YELLOW</b> - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction<br><b>RED</b> - Reductions are less than 50% of the historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible   |
| 4. | <b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</b><br><br><b>OPERATING REVENUES</b><br><br><b>EXPENDITURES</b> | <b>GREEN</b> - The net fiscal impact on local government is negative and comparatively large.<br>(Expenditures savings are less than 75% of revenue losses)<br><b>YELLOW</b> - The net fiscal impact on local government is negative, but comparatively small.<br>(Expenditures savings are 75% or more of revenue losses)<br><b>RED</b> - The net fiscal impact on local government is neutral or positive. (Expenditures savings exceed revenue losses) |
| 5. | <b>INSTALLATION</b><br><b>RESTORATION</b><br><b>PROGRAMS (IRP)</b>                  | <b>GREEN</b> - Actual clean-up time is estimated to be lengthy (> 5 yrs)<br><b>YELLOW</b> - Actual clean-up time is moderate (about 5 yrs)<br><b>RED</b> - Actual clean-up time is estimated to be relatively short (< 5 yrs)   |

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

**EMPLOYMENT (crit. 1)**

BARKSDALE	Y
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	Y
CASTLE	G
DYESS	G
EAKER	G
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	Y
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	G
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	Y
McCONNELL	R
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	G
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - Reductions exceed historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**YELLOW** - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**RED** - Reductions are less than 50% of historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

**POPULATION (crit. 2)**

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	Y
CASTLE	G
DYESS	G
EAKER	G
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	G
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	G
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	G
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	G
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - Reductions exceed historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**YELLOW** - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**RED** - Reductions are less than 50% of historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

**INCOME (crit. 3)**

BARKSDALE	Y
BEALE	Y
CARSWELL	Y
CASTLE	Y
DYESS	G
EAKER	G
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	Y
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	R
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	Y
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	R
McCONNELL	Y
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	Y
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - Reductions exceed historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**YELLOW** - Reductions are between 50% of the historic high reduction and the historic high reduction (1969-1987)

**RED** - Reductions are less than 50% of historic high reduction (1969-1987), or negligible

**UNCLASSIFIED**



**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT OPERATING REVENUES/EXPENDITURES (crit. 4)**

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	R
CASTLE	G
DYESS	G
EAKER	G
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	Y
GRISSOM	G
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	R
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	Y
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	Y
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - The net fiscal impact on local government is negative and comparatively large.  
(Expenditures savings are less than 75% of revenue losses.)

**YELLOW** - The net fiscal impact on local government is negative, but comparatively small.  
(Expenditures savings are 75% or more of revenue losses.)

**RED** - The net fiscal impact on local government is neutral or positive. (Expenditures savings exceed revenue losses.)

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VI. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES**

**INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAMS (IRP) (crit. 5)**

BARKSDALE	Y
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	Y
CASTLE	G
DYESS	Y
EAKER	R
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	R
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	Y
KI SAWYER	Y
LORING	G
MALMSTROM	Y
MARCH	G
McCONNELL	Y
MINOT	R
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	Y
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - Actual clean-up time is estimated to be lengthy (greater than 5 years).

**YELLOW** - Actual clean-up time is estimated to be moderate (about 5 years).

**RED** - Actual clean-up time is estimated to be relatively short (within 5 years).

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**CRITERIA VI**

	EMPLOYMENT	POPULATION	INCOME	LOCAL GOVERNMENT OPERATING REVENUES /EXPENDITURES	IRP
BARKSDALE	Y	G	Y	G	Y
BEALE	G	G	Y	G	G
CARSWELL	Y	Y	Y	R	Y
CASTLE	G	G	Y	G	G
DYESS	G	G	G	G	Y
EAKER	G	G	G	G	R
ELLSWORTH	G	G	G	G	G
FAIRCHILD	G	G	Y	G	G
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G	G	R
GRIFFISS	G	G	G	Y	G
GRISSOM	Y	G	R	G	Y
KI SAWYER	G	G	G	G	Y
LORING	G	G	Y	R	G
MALMSTROM	G	G	G	G	Y
MARCH	Y	G	R	Y	G
McCONNELL	R	G	Y	G	Y
MINOT	G	G	G	G	R
OFFUTT	G	G	G	G	G
PLATTSBURGHG	G	G	G	G	G
WHITEMAN	G	G	Y	Y	Y
WURTSMITH	G	G	G	G	G

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**VII. THE ABILITY OF BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING COMMUNITIES' INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT FORCES, MISSIONS, AND PERSONNEL**

**1. Community Infrastructure**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>A. Affordable, acceptable off-base housing</b> | <b>GREEN - Yes</b><br><b>RED - No</b>                         |
| <b>B. Base served by public transportation</b>    | <b>GREEN - Yes</b><br><b>RED - No</b>                         |
| <b>C. Adequate recreation facilities off base</b> | <b>GREEN - Yes</b><br><b>RED - No</b>                         |
| <b>D. Adequate shopping facilities</b>            | <b>GREEN - 20 miles or less</b><br><b>RED - &gt; 20 miles</b> |

**2. Education**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>A. Pupil to Teacher Ratio<br/>(Max allowable ratio)</b> | <b>GREEN - <math>\leq 25</math> to 1</b><br><b>YELLOW - 26 - 30 to 1</b><br><b>RED - &gt; 30 to 1</b>   |
| <b>B. Students that go on to college</b>                   | <b>GREEN - <math>\geq 60\%</math></b><br><b>YELLOW - 40% to 59%</b><br><b>RED - &lt; 40%</b>  |
| <b>C. Opportunity for off-base education</b>               | <b>GREEN - Under/Grad courses within 25 miles</b><br><b>YELLOW - Less course opportunity within 25 miles</b><br><b>RED - No education opportunity within 25 miles</b> |

**3. Availability of community medical facilities**

- |  |
|--|
| <b>GREEN - Adequate, no adverse impact</b> |
| <b>YELLOW - Available, minimal impact</b>  |
| <b>RED - Medically underserved</b>         |

**UNCL/IFIED**

# UNCLASIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### VII. THE ABILITY OF BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING COMMUNITIES' INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT FORCES, MISSIONS, AND PERSONNEL

##### 1. Community Infrastructure

	Affordable	Pub Trans	Recreation	Shopping
BARKSDALE	G	G	G	G
BEALE	R	G	G	G
CARSWELL	R	G	G	G
CASTLE	R	R	G	G
DYESS	G	R	R	R
EAKER	G	G	G	G
ELLSWORTH	G	G	G	G
FAIRCHILD	R	G	G	G
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G	G
GRIFFISS	R	G	G	G
GRISSOM	G	R	G	R
KI SAWYER	R	R	G	R
LORING	G	R	R	R
MALMSTROM	R	G	G	G
MARCH	R	G	G	G
McCONNELL	R	G	G	G
MINOT	G	R	G	G
OFFUTT	G	G	G	G
PLATTSBURGH	G	R	G	G
WHITEMAN	R	R	R	R
WURTSMITH	R	R	R	R

- A. Affordable, acceptable off-basing
- B. Base served by public transportation
- C. Adequate recreation facilities off base
- D. Adequate shopping facilities

GREEN - Yes RED - No  
 GREEN - Yes RED - No  
 GREEN - Yes RED - No  
 GREEN - 20 miles or less  
 RED - > 20 miles

UNCLASSIFIED

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### VII. THE ABILITY OF BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING COMMUNITIES' INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT FORCES, MISSIONS, AND PERSONNEL

##### 2. Education

	Ratio	College	Education
BARKSDALE	Y	Y	G
BEALE	Y	G	G
CARSWELL	Y	G	G
CASTLE	R	G	G
DYESS	G	G	G
EAKER	G	G	G
ELLSWORTH	G	Y	G
FAIRCHILD	Y	G	Y
GRAND FORKS	Y	G	G
GRIFFISS	Y	G	Y
GRISSOM	Y	Y	G
KI SAWYER	Y	G	G
LORING	G	G	Y
MALMSTROM	Y	Y	G
MARCH	R	R	G
McCONNELL	Y	Y	G
MINOT	Y	G	Y
OFFUTT	Y	G	G
PLATTSBURGH	Y	R	G
WHITEMAN	Y	G	G
WURTSMITH	Y	Y	Y

A. Pupil to Teacher Ratio

B. Students that go on to college

C. Opportunity for off-base education

GREEN -  $\leq 25$  to 1; YELLOW - 26 - 30 to 1; RED -  $> 30$  to 1

GREEN -  $\geq 60\%$ ; YELLOW - 40% to 59%; RED -  $< 40\%$

GREEN - Under/Grad courses within 25 miles

YELLOW - Less course opportunity within 25 miles

RED - No education opportunity within 25 miles

# UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLAS SIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VII. THE ABILITY OF BOTH THE EXISTING AND POTENTIAL RECEIVING COMMUNITIES'  
INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT FORCES, MISSIONS, AND PERSONNEL**

**3. Availability of community medical facilities**

	Community
BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	G
CASTLE	G
DYESS	G
EAKER	Y
ELLSWORTH	Y
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	G
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	G
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	Y
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	G
McCONNELL	Y
MINOT	Y
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	Y
WURTSMITH	Y

Availability of community medical facilities

GREEN - Adequate, no adverse impact  
YELLOW - Available, minimal impact  
RED - Medically underserved

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**CRITERIA VII**

	Affordable	Pub Trans	Recreation	Shopping	Ratio	College	Education	Medical
BARKSDALE	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G
BEALE	R	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G
CARSWELL	R	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G
CASTLE	R	R	G	G	R	G	G	G
DYESS	G	R	G	G	G	G	G	G
EAKER	G	R	R	R	G	G	G	Y
ELLSWORTH	G	G	G	G	G	Y	G	Y
FAIRCHILD	R	G	G	G	Y	G	Y	G
GRAND FORKS	G	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G
GRIFFISS	R	G	G	G	Y	G	Y	G
GRISSOM	G	R	G	G	Y	Y	G	G
KI SAWYER	R	R	G	R	Y	G	G	G
LORING	G	R	R	R	G	G	Y	Y
MALMSTROM	R	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G
MARCH	R	G	G	G	R	R	G	G
McCONNELL	R	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	Y
MINOT	G	R	G	G	Y	G	Y	Y
OFFUTT	G	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G
PLATTSBURGH	G	R	G	G	Y	R	G	G
WHITEMAN	R	R	R	G	Y	G	G	Y
WURTSMITH	R	R	R	R	Y	Y	Y	Y

**UNCLASSIFIED**



**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

1. **AIR QUALITY**  
GREEN - Base is in attainment for all pollutants. No restrictions on construction/operations.  
YELLOW - Base is in non-attainment area. No restrictions on construction/operations.  
RED - Base is in non-attainment area and construction/operations constraints apply.
2. **WATER**  
GREEN - Adequate regional water supplies and no known contaminants present  
YELLOW - Suspect regional water supplies; contaminants present within a non-potable water zone  
RED - Inadequate regional water supplies and/or region within a state of over draft and/or contaminants detected within potable water sources
3. **HAZARDOUS MATERIAL - SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE**
  - A. Asbestos  
GREEN - < 10% facilities with asbestos containing materials (ACM)  
YELLOW - > 10% and < 25% facilities with ACM; survey incomplete. unable to assess percentages  
RED - > 25% facilities containing ACM
  - B. Radon  
GREEN - Radon not present or detected < 4 pic/l  
YELLOW - Radon present; detection > 4 pic/l & < 20 pic/l  
RED - Radon present; detection > 20 pic/l
  - C. Solid Waste  
GREEN - Existing regional disposal facilities have > 10 years capacity remaining  
YELLOW - Existing regional disposal facilities have 5 to 10 years capacity remaining  
RED - Existing regional disposal facilities have < 5 years capacity remaining
4. **BIOLOGICAL**
  - A. Habitat  
GREEN - Resources not present  
YELLOW - Resources present which do not currently constrain construction/operations  
RED - Resources present which constrain current construction/operations or require "work arounds" to support current operation
  - B. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)     G/Y/R (same as habitat)
  - C. Wetlands     G/Y/R (same as habitat)

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY CRITERIA**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.**  
(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**5. CULTURAL**

---

GREEN - No existing resources  
YELLOW - Historic or ineligible prehistoric resources are present, but do not currently constrain construction/operations, or base survey incomplete  
RED - Eligible or potentially eligible prehistoric resources are present and constrain current construction/operations

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**A. Prime and unique  
farmlands**

GREEN - No prime and unique farmlands exist  
YELLOW - Prime and unique farmlands exist; resources compatible with current construction/operations  
RED - Prime and unique farmlands exist; large areas; resources incompatible with current construction/operations

**B. Mineral/Energy  
Resources**

GREEN - No known resources  
YELLOW - Resources currently exist; no known constraint on current construction/operations  
RED - Resources currently exist and constrain on current construction/operations

**C. Soil Contamination**

GREEN - No soil contaminants present  
YELLOW - Soil contaminants present which do not currently constrain construction/operations  
RED - Soil contaminants present which constrain current construction/operations

UNCL. IFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**AIR QUALITY (crit. 1)**

<u>BARKSDALE</u>	G
<u>BEALE</u>	Y
<u>CARSWELL</u>	Y
<u>CASTLE</u>	R
<u>DYESS</u>	G
<u>EAKER</u>	G
<u>ELLSWORTH</u>	G
<u>FAIRCHILD</u>	Y
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	G
<u>GRIFFISS</u>	G
<u>GRISSOM</u>	G
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	G
<u>LORING</u>	G
<u>MALMSTROM</u>	Y
<u>MARCH</u>	Y
<u>McCONNELL</u>	G
<u>MINOT</u>	G
<u>OFFUTT</u>	G
<u>PLATTSBURGH</u>	G
<u>WHITEMAN</u>	G
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	G

**GREEN** - Base is in attainment for all pollutants. No restrictions on construction/operations.  
**YELLOW** - Base is in non-attainment area. No restrictions on construction/operations.  
**RED** - Base is in non-attainment area and construction/operations constraints apply.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**WATER (crit. 2)**

<u>BARKSDALE</u>	Y
<u>BEALE</u>	R
<u>CARSWELL</u>	Y
<u>CASTLE</u>	R
<u>DYESS</u>	Y
<u>EAKER</u>	Y
<u>ELLSWORTH</u>	R
<u>FAIRCHILD</u>	R
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	Y
<u>GRIFFISS</u>	R
<u>GRISSOM</u>	Y
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	R
<u>LORING</u>	Y
<u>MALMSTROM</u>	G
<u>MARCH</u>	R
<u>McCONNELL</u>	Y
<u>MINOT</u>	G
<u>OFFUTT</u>	Y
<u>PLATTSBURGH</u>	Y
<u>WHITEMAN</u>	Y
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	R

**GREEN** - Adequate regional water supplies and no known contaminants present.

**YELLOW** - Suspect regional water supplies; contaminants present within a non-potable water zone.

**RED** - Inadequate regional water supplies and/or region within a state of over draft and/or contaminants detected within potable water sources.

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**  
(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**HAZARDOUS MATERIAL -- SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE**

**ASBESTOS (crit. 3a)**

BARKSDALE	Y
BEALE	Y
CARSWELL	R
CASTLE	Y
DYESS	Y
EAKER	R
ELLSWORTH	Y
FAIRCHILD	R
GRAND FORKS	R
GRIFFISS	R
GRISSOM	R
KI SAWYER	Y
LORING	R
MALMSTROM	R
MARCH	Y
McCONNELL	R
MINOT	R
OFFUTT	R
PLATTSBURGH	R
WHITEMAN	G
WURTSMITH	Y

**GREEN** - < 10% facilities with asbestos containing materials (ACM)

**YELLOW** - > 10% and < 25% facilities with ACM; survey incomplete; unable to assess percentages

**RED** - > 25% facilities containing ACM

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**HAZARDOUS MATERIAL -- SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE**

**RADON (crit. 3b)**

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
<u>CARSWELL</u>	<u>Y</u>
CASTLE	G
DYESS	G
<u>EAKER</u>	<u>G</u>
ELLSWORTH	R
FAIRCHILD	Y
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	<u>Y</u>
GRIFFISS	Y
GRISSOM	Y
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	<u>G</u>
LORING	Y
MALMSTROM	G
<u>MARCH</u>	<u>G</u>
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	G
<u>OFFUTT</u>	<u>Y</u>
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	Y
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	<u>G</u>

**GREEN** - Radon not present or detected < 4 pic/l

**YELLOW** - Radon present; detection > 4 pic/l and < 20 pic/l

**RED** - Radon present; detection > 20 pic/l

UNCLASIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**HAZARDOUS MATERIAL -- SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE**

**SOLID WASTE (crit. 3c)**

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	G
CARSWELL	G
CASTLE	R
DYESS	G
EAKER	Y
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
GRAND FORKS	Y
GRIFFISS	G
GRISSOM	G
KI SAWYER	G
LORING	R
MALMSTROM	G
MARCH	G
McCONNELL	Y
MINOT	G
OFFUTT	G
PLATTSBURGH	R
WHITEMAN	R
WURTSMITH	G

**GREEN** - Existing regional disposal facilities have >10 years capacity remaining

**YELLOW** - Existing regional disposal facilities have 5 to 10 years capacity remaining

**RED** - Existing regional disposal facilities have <5 years capacity remaining

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

		BIOLOGICAL THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES (crit. 4b)	WETLANDS (crit. 4c)
	HABITAT (crit. 4a)		
BARKSDALE	Y	Y	R
BEALE	Y	Y	R
CARSWELL	G	G	Y
CASTLE	G	G	G
DYESS	G	G	Y
EAKER	G	G	Y
ELLSWORTH	G	G	Y
FAIRCHILD	G	G	Y
GRAND FORKS	G	G	Y
GRIFFISS	Y	Y	Y
GRISSOM	G	G	G
KI SAWYER	G	G	Y
LORING	G	G	Y
MALMSTROM	G	G	Y
MARCH	Y	Y	Y
McCONNELL	G	G	Y
MINOT	G	G	Y
OFFUTT	G	G	Y
PLATTSBURGH	G	G	Y
WHITEMAN	G	G	Y
WURTSMITH	Y	Y	Y

**GREEN** - Resources not present.

**YELLOW** - Resources present which do not currently constrain construction/operations.

**RED** - Resources present which constrain current construction/operations or require "work arounds" to support current operations

UNCL ASSIFIED



**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**  
(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**CULTURAL RESOURCES (crit. 5)**

BARKSDALE	Y
BEALE	R
<u>CARSWELL</u>	<u>Y</u>
CASTLE	G
DYESS	Y
<u>EAKER</u>	<u>Y</u>
ELLSWORTH	Y
FAIRCHILD	G
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	<u>Y</u>
GRIFFISS	Y
GRISSOM	G
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	<u>Y</u>
LORING	Y
MALMSTROM	G
<u>MARCH</u>	<u>Y</u>
McCONNELL	Y
MINOT	Y
<u>OFFUTT</u>	<u>Y</u>
PLATTSBURGH	Y
WHITEMAN	G
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	<u>R</u>

**GREEN** - No existing resources.

**YELLOW** - Historic or ineligible prehistoric resources are present, but do not currently constrain construction/operations, or base survey incomplete.

**RED** - Eligible or potentially eligible prehistoric resources are present and constrain current construction/operations.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED  
FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**  
(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**PRIME AND UNIQUE FARMLANDS (crit. 6a)**

BARKSDALE	G
BEALE	Y
<u>CARSWELL</u>	G
CASTLE	G
DYESS	Y
<u>EAKER</u>	Y
ELLSWORTH	G
FAIRCHILD	G
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	Y
GRIFFISS	Y
GRISSOM	G
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	G
LORING	G
MALMSTROM	G
<u>MARCH</u>	G
McCONNELL	G
MINOT	Y
<u>OFFUTT</u>	G
PLATTSBURGH	G
WHITEMAN	G
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	G

**GREEN** - No prime and unique farmlands exist.

**YELLOW** - Prime and unique farmlands exist; resources compatible with current construction/operations.

**RED** - Prime and unique farmlands exist; large areas; resources incompatible with current construction/operations.

**UNCL ASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**MINERAL/ENERGY RESOURCES (crit. 6b)**

<u>BARKSDALE</u>	Y
<u>BEALE</u>	G
<u>CARSWELL</u>	G
<u>CASTLE</u>	G
<u>DYESS</u>	Y
<u>EAKER</u>	G
<u>ELLSWORTH</u>	G
<u>FAIRCHILD</u>	G
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	Y
<u>GRIFFISS</u>	G
<u>GRISSOM</u>	G
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	G
<u>LORING</u>	G
<u>MALMSTROM</u>	G
<u>MARCH</u>	G
<u>McCONNELL</u>	G
<u>MINOT</u>	G
<u>OFFUTT</u>	G
<u>PLATTSBURGH</u>	G
<u>WHITEMAN</u>	G
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	Y

**GREEN** - No known resources.

**YELLOW** - Resources currently exist; no known constraint on current construction/operations.

**RED** - Resources currently exist and constrain current construction/operations.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED  
FLYING CATEGORY  
STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**VIII. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

(Assessment of existing conditions for decision making)

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**SOIL CONTAMINATION (crit. 6c)**

<u>BARKSDALE</u>	Y
<u>BEALE</u>	Y
<u>CARSWELL</u>	Y
<u>CASTLE</u>	Y
<u>DYESS</u>	Y
<u>EAKER</u>	Y
<u>ELLSWORTH</u>	Y
<u>FAIRCHILD</u>	Y
<u>GRAND FORKS</u>	Y
<u>GRIFFISS</u>	Y
<u>GRISSOM</u>	Y
<u>KI SAWYER</u>	Y
<u>LORING</u>	Y
<u>MALMSTROM</u>	Y
<u>MARCH</u>	Y
<u>McCONNELL</u>	Y
<u>MINOT</u>	G
<u>OFFUTT</u>	Y
<u>PLATTSBURGH</u>	Y
<u>WHITEMAN</u>	Y
<u>WURTSMITH</u>	Y

**GREEN** - No soil contaminants present.

**YELLOW** - Soil contaminants present which do not currently constrain construction/operations.

**RED** - Soil contaminants present which constrain current construction/operations.

**UNCL SIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**CRITERIA VIII**

	AQ	Wa	As	Ra	SW	CH	T&E	W	CUL	P&U	M/E	SL
BARKSDALE	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y	Y	R	Y	G	Y	Y
BEALE	Y	R	Y	G	G	Y	Y	R	R	Y	G	Y
CARSWELL	Y	Y	R	Y	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
CASTLE	R	R	Y	G	R	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y
DYESS	G	Y	Y	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
EAKER	G	Y	R	G	Y	G	G	Y	Y	Y	G	Y
ELLSWORTH	G	R	Y	R	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
FAIRCHILD	Y	R	R	Y	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G	Y
GRAND FORKS	G	Y	R	Y	Y	G	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
GRIFFISS	G	R	R	Y	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	G	Y
GRISSOM	G	Y	R	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	Y
KI SAWYER	G	R	Y	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
LORING	G	Y	R	Y	R	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
MALMSTROM	Y	G	R	G	G	G	G	Y	G	G	G	Y
MARCH	Y	R	Y	G	G	Y	Y	Y	Y	G	G	Y
McCONNELL	G	Y	R	G	Y	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
MINOT	G	G	R	G	G	G	G	Y	Y	Y	G	G
OFFUTT	G	Y	R	Y	G	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
PLATTSBURGH	G	Y	R	G	R	G	G	Y	Y	G	G	Y
WHITEMAN	G	Y	G	Y	R	G	G	Y	G	G	G	Y
WURTSMITH	G	R	Y	G	G	Y	Y	Y	R	G	Y	Y

AQ - Air Quality

As - Asbestos

CH - Critical  
Habitat

CUL - Cultural

M/E - Mineral/Energy

P&U - Prime and Unique  
Farmlands

Ra - Radon

SL - Soil

SW - Solid Waste

T&E - Threatened and  
Endangered Species

W - Wetlands

Wa - Water

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# UNCLASSIFIED

## FLYING CATEGORY

### STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY

#### Summary of Strategic Bases

**Option 1**  
Priority on Military  
Value. Emphasis on  
Readiness & TNG

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Dyess  
Ellsworth  
Grand Forks  
McConnell  
Minot  
Offutt

Group 2  
Beale  
Castle  
Eaker  
Fairchild  
KI Sawyer  
Malmstrom  
Whiteman

Group 3  
Carswell  
Griffiss  
Grissom  
Loring \*  
March  
Plattsburgh \*  
Wurtsmith

**Option 2**  
Priority on Military  
Value. Emphasis on  
Readiness & TNG.  
Downplay Future

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Dyess  
Ellsworth  
Grand Forks  
McConnell  
Minot  
Offutt

Group 2  
Beale  
Castle  
Eaker  
Fairchild  
KI Sawyer  
Malmstrom  
Whiteman

Group 3  
Carswell  
Griffiss  
Grissom  
Loring \*  
March  
Plattsburgh \*  
Wurtsmith

**Option 3**  
Priority on Military  
Value. Emphasis on  
Readiness & TNG.  
Emphasize Future

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Dyess  
Ellsworth  
Grand Forks  
Minot  
Offutt

Group 2  
Beale  
Eaker  
Fairchild  
Grissom  
KI Sawyer  
Malmstrom  
McConnell  
Whiteman

Group 3  
Carswell  
Castle  
Griffiss  
Loring \*  
March  
Plattsburgh \*  
Wurtsmith

**Option 4**  
Priority on Military  
Value.  
Emphasis on Cost

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Dyess  
Ellsworth  
Griffiss  
McConnell  
Offutt  
Whiteman

Group 2  
Carswell  
Castle  
Grand Forks  
Malmstrom  
March  
Minot

Group 3  
Beale  
Eaker  
Fairchild  
Grissom  
KI Sawyer  
Loring \*  
Plattsburgh \*  
Wurtsmith

**Option 5**  
Priority on Military  
Value. Emphasis on  
Readiness & TNG;  
Future & Cost

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Dyess  
Ellsworth  
Grand Forks  
Offutt  
Whiteman

Group 2  
Beale  
Castle  
Fairchild  
Griffiss  
KI Sawyer  
Malmstrom  
March  
McConnell  
Minot

Group 3  
Carswell  
Eaker  
Grissom  
Loring \*  
Plattsburgh \*  
Wurtsmith

**Option 6**  
Priority on Military  
Value. Emphasis on  
Wartime

Group 1  
Barksdale  
Ellsworth  
Grand Forks  
KI Sawyer  
Malmstrom  
Minot  
Offutt

Group 2  
Dyess  
Fairchild  
Griffiss  
Loring \*  
McConnell  
Plattsburgh \*  
Whiteman  
Wurtsmith

Group 3  
Beale  
Carswell  
Castle  
Eaker  
Grissom  
March

\* Closing both Loring and Plattsburgh will severely impact SIOP execution & Tanker Task Force Support

UNCL. SIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
**FLYING CATEGORY**  
**STRATEGIC SUBCATEGORY**

**Summary of Strategic Bases with MILCON Adjustments**

Option 5: Priority on military value, with emphasis on readiness and training, future, and cost.

CRITERIA	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
BARKSDALE	G-	G	G	198.5/247	4	Y	G	G-
BEALE	Y+	Y+	Y	106.5/328	1	G	Y+	Y-
CARSWELL	Y	R+	Y	64.6/72	6	Y	Y+	Y
CASTLE	Y+	Y-	Y	102.7/263	2	G	Y-	Y-
DYESS	G	Y+	G-	238.2/210	5	G	G	Y+
EAKER	Y+	G-	G-	22.0/359	0	G	Y	Y+
ELLSWORTH	G	Y	Y	319.3/107	>10	G	G-	Y
FAIRCHILD	G-	Y	Y-	76.6/384	1	G	Y+	Y
GRAND FORKS	G	Y+	Y-	217.8/225	3	G-	G	Y+
GRIFFISS	Y	Y+	Y+	220.1/337	4	G	Y+	Y
GRISSOM	Y	Y+	G	35.0/250	1	Y+	G-	G-
KI SAWYER	G-	G	Y-	39.8/372	1	G-	Y+	G-
LORING	Y	Y-	Y-	44.6/465	1	G-	Y	Y
MALMSTROM	G-	Y-	Y	133.7/251	2	G-	Y+	G-
MARCH	Y	R+	G	137.0/175	4	Y	Y-	Y
McCONNELL	G	Y+	G	139.9/209	3	Y	Y	Y+
MINOT	G	Y+	R+	115.0/255	2	G	Y+	G-
OFFUTT	G	Y-	Y-	659.1/(340)	>20	G	G	G-
PLATTSBURGH	Y	G-	Y+	27.0/413	0	G	G-	Y+
WHITEMAN	Y+	Y+	Y	447.0/6	>10	Y	Y	Y+
WURTSMITH	Y	Y	Y	33.0/374	1	G	R	Y

**UNCLASSIFIED**